

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

December 12, 2006

5:15 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Lopez, Smith, Forest

Absent: Alderman DeVries

Messrs.: M. Normand, D. Prew, J. Angell, F. Thomas, C. Johnson,
G. Sullivan, T. Arnold, R. Sherman, T. Piecuch

Chairman O'Neil stated with the Committee's blessing I would like to take Item 7 up first and have Mr. Normand come forward.

Communication from NeighborWorks Greater Manchester submitting proposed ordinance amendments relating to negligent property owners/landlords.

Matthew Normand, Deputy Clerk, stated we would just note that the...I know the Building Department hasn't had time to really digest the information that is enclosed in the agenda here. I know the Solicitor...I don't know if the Solicitor's Office has reviewed it so I guess we would look for just a recommendation that it be sent to a staff committee that could come back at the next Committee meeting with a report or some kind of proposal.

Alderman Smith stated I met with the Building Department several times – almost on a weekly basis in regards to some of these properties and I would like to see the issue come to a final conclusion. We are having problems in certain areas as you well know on the West Side and I have been in touch with the Building Department with some mixed results and some of the things still continue so I would like to move this as fast as possible.

Mr. Normand responded I don't know that the Solicitor's Office has reviewed the fines and such so as long...I mean certainly the fines probably need to be increased but I don't know if the Building Department is prepared tonight to comment on that. I know that Leon was not available for tonight's meeting but certainly we could report at the next Committee meeting.

Chairman O'Neil asked Matt does this tie into...it ties into a lot of work the Neighborhood Enhancement Team is doing correct.

Mr. Normand answered correct. One item that was in the letter talking about dedicating a full time staff person I know that most of members of the Neighborhood Enhancement Team agree wholeheartedly with that. We have had 114 hits on the website, 80 complaints that are valid complaints, and 35 inspections. It is just a matter of time management at this point. Certainly if there was a full time staff member dedicated to that it would improve things but again if we could look it over as a group and then get back to the Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't have any major problem with that it is just that we knew this was coming and staff should have looked at it before and the City Solicitor should have looked at. It has been a major problem in the City. That is number one and you know that and I don't have to tell you that but it seems that maybe the first offense we are too low for everybody to throw all of their garbage out there and we have to spend five hours picking it all up. Maybe some of these things should be higher. As far as funding a complete NET team, you know that is another issue money wise. The NET team working eight hours a day, five days a week versus...how many times are you going out a week now?

Mr. Normand responded it is probably one every three weeks but I don't think that is...the need is not for a full NET team. I think the need is for...like for instance the Solid Waste Compliance Officer that wasn't funded. I have talked to Dennis Hebert and there is federal funding for programs such as that and if funds can become available to fund that position that would be huge. Predominantly the complaints we get are trash and junk related. That is one position that has already been approved in the budget process but not funded.

Alderman Lopez replied I understand that but on the NET team itself I mean I don't want to get too involved and you have been working with it but we need some concrete recommendations as to a budget for what we are talking about. I know the Mayor said the NET team is going to continue but I also know that the people working...if we are doing it every three weeks we are not getting anywhere.

Chairman O'Neil stated Matt I know you are going to be out for a little bit but will you be able to make sure that it gets back to us as quickly as possible.

Mr. Normand answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to refer this item to City staff to come back with a report at the next meeting of the Committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated and as we found with the NET team you need full support of all of the departments to get back to you with their concerns, etc. so you can report back at the next meeting. I want to thank Matt for being here tonight and staying around.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Status report to be presented by Diane Prew, Director of Information Services.

Alderman Forest stated before Diane begins I understand this will be her last presentation to this Committee.

Chairman O'Neil responded it will be. We are losing her at the end of the month. We did recognize her at the last meeting but I think it would be appropriate...thank you for bringing that up Alderman Forest, for her long and dedicated services to the City of Manchester I think a round of applause would be in order.

Diane Prew, Director, Information Systems, stated thank you for having us once again. I would like to introduce Jennie Angell who will be the acting department head for the Information Systems Department as of the 29th of December and I am sure she will do a very good job for you. Our presentation this evening is based upon a request that Alderman Lopez made at the last meeting to have a status update on the department before I left. The topics I would like to cover this evening are what our staffing situation is at this time, where we stand with the budget for this year, going over briefly what we are supporting and then to talk about the planned projects we had for this year and the unplanned projects that come up during every year and then our concerns for the coming budget season. Since 2003, we have had a staff of 19 members. As of FY07 we have 16 approved funded positions. Currently 13 of those positions are filled and 2 are vacant. That is made up of one Programmer position, which we are currently interviewing for. The salary range has been somewhat problematic. The initial candidates wanted the top of the range so we have since advertised showing the top at mid range hoping to attract some candidates in the salary range we are looking for. We have one position that is on military leave. The second vacant position is our LAN Administrator position. If all goes well, we hope to have our LAN Administrator back with us on Monday so that is a very good thing for the City. We have one Microcomputer Specialist that is on military leave. He will be on military leave

until September 2007 and then of course my position will be vacant as of the 29th of this month. The rest of the 19 positions...one is a Telecommunications Specialist that is funded in our budget but has not been approved by the Mayor for hire. Then we had two positions that were not funded as part of the budget and that was one Programmer and our Administrative Assistant. What all of that means to us is that we are currently working with about 1/3 less of our regular complement. It is definitely having an effect on how quickly we can get things done and the staff is noticing that our departments are not asking for things because they know we don't have the resources. This is not a good thing because I think we will be missing opportunities to help the departments become more efficient. Our 2007 budget. We currently have sufficient funds in our payroll to cover all of our payroll needs. This is because we have had so many vacancies during the year. Our line item budget...most of our line item budget has been committed. We had a line item budget of \$571,000. We have \$65,000 of that uncommitted. Now quite a bit is encumbered but \$65,000 for the next six months is going to be a challenge to meet anything that might unexpectedly arise. A point I would like to make here is that of our line item budget, 73% is tied up in our service agreements. Our service agreements are software and hardware maintenance contracts. This number is definitely going to go up next year because of the new computer-aided dispatching records management system and to give you an idea of what numbers we are looking at, HTE costs us \$166,000 a year to use and those numbers go up as the cost of living go up so those go up on a yearly basis. The CAD system...currently the two systems that Police and Fire are using cost \$70,000. The new joint system will cost \$120,000 so you are looking at a \$50,000 increase because of that new system. Our five year upgrade replacement plan...we received as part of the budget process \$250,000. We are replacing PC's that are between five and six years old at this time. We will also be upgrading our IBM I-series. That is the computer that runs HTE and we are upgrading services that are going out of warranty. The \$250,000 is something we hope will be an ongoing part of the budget. It allows us to keep current with our equipment and not allow everything to become obsolete and then have an enormous replacement cost somewhere down the road. The other part of this slide that doesn't show up very well talks about what we are currently supporting. We are supporting the City's computer users and all of the devices that they use. This is 900+ PC's across 30 departments in 51 buildings. I just want to clarify...at one presentation we made earlier we were asked why we had so many PC's – 900. We obviously don't have 900 people sitting at desks in the City. Well the City has PC's not only on employee desks but we have a number of PC's in the Library that are there for public use. We have PC's in the Senior Center, which are there for the seniors to use. There is a computer lab. There are PC's at the Maple Street Youth Center that are there for youths. The Police Department has mobile data terminals in their cruisers. There are PC's on department's counters such as the Assessor's Office, that are there for the public to use. So there are lots of systems that are not

assigned to specific people but have very specific uses and that is how the numbers get as high as they are. We support all of the software that the departments use. The centralized software such as HTE, e-mail, and GIS, which is the Geographic Information System. We also support all of the departmental applications. The Assessor's Appraisal system, business licensing, and many others and the productivity tools like spreadsheets, word processing, etc. We also support the City's municipal network as we discussed at the last meeting and the City's website. We would just like to call to your attention that our website was recognized by the National Policy Research Council when they did an evaluation of all of the municipal and state websites and we were one of 30 cities in the 50,000 to 250,000 population that received a report card grading and we received an A on our website. I think that is something we can be proud of. We also support the City's telephone system. Our planned projects for 2007...we gave you a fairly detailed handout that goes through all of those projects. If you would like to keep that as a reference document as you go through the coming year's budget process it will give you some idea of the kinds of things that we will be working on. Under software and data protection, we had the upgrade of the Assessor's appraisal system. These are just some examples for you. This was a project that was crucial to the recent revaluation. This project is done. The software needed to be upgraded and we had to do things to HTE and all of the tax bills went out smoothly. The Police and Fire computer-aided dispatch and records management system is an ongoing project. We did give a presentation on that. That project is currently on schedule. I believe that the Fire Department is looking to go live in June 2007 and the Police Department in August. Right now the budget for the project is looking good, especially with our LAN Administrator coming back we should be able to move forward with the network engineering that needs to be done for that project. Another large project that is coming up is the motor vehicle registration upgrade and replacement system. The City currently collects some \$16 million in motor vehicle registration fees and the state has deployed a new registration system and has issued requirements for all current municipal agents to commit to use or interface with the new system. Tony Shaffer from my staff and Joan Porter from the Tax Office have been reviewing the various options in detail and the choices open to the City are to interface with the City's current motor vehicle system with the state and that would require from 12-18 months of work to put that in place plus it requires recertifications by the state on an annual basis, which is also very labor intensive. A second choice would be to purchase and deploy a new system that is designed to interface with the state and the third choice would be to use the state system natively. What the Tax Collector and Tony Shaffer have found is that the state system used on a large scale such as the City would use would slow the process down enormously. The system is really not designed for the high volume that the City has and the city of Nashua and some of the other larger cities are facing the same issue. Right now they are preparing an RFP to see what it would cost to purchase a new system so you will

be hearing more about that with the budget process. Another item is our I-series operating system upgrade. The I-series again is the IBM computer that HTE runs on. Periodically the operating system version needs to be refreshed and that involves both our main system at Info. Systems and the back-up system at the Rines Center. That may not sound like a whole lot but that requires about two man weeks to go through that process. Then we have the high availability disaster recovery system. I think Alderman O'Neil expressed some interest in this once before. This is where the HTE data is replicated to our back-up site. Because of our staffing situation we have not been able to get to that particular project at this time. So that is one of those that has been affected by the reduced staff. The last item...our public GIS website. That is another item that we hope to address this year but again these things are affected by the staff. The secondary are the networking and hardware and that is Jennie's specialty so I will let her speak to those issues.

Jennie Angell stated I will try to go through these fairly quickly. This is just a highlight of some of the major projects we are working on. The first one, the computer room environmental upgrade, the HVAC and power that is in our computer room now is pretty much original to the room in 1980 so we will be getting new heating, air conditioning and power. This upgrade is required for the new systems that are coming in especially for the computer-aided dispatch. This project is being managed by Facilities. They are doing a great job and we are expecting pricing this week for a start date in the upcoming year. The next item is connecting and configuring the fiber. This is the fiber that we did last year as part of the Homeland Security Grant funding. At this point all of the fire stations with the exception of Hackett Hill are connected by a fiber so this gives them greater capabilities and as we said earlier in other meetings we have requested grant funding for running fiber to Hackett Hill and we are waiting to see if we get that. Upgrading PC desktops. This unfortunately is going a little slower than we had hoped because of the staffing issues. We were hoping to be further along with this than we are right now so we are looking at options to go forward to get this done this year. Increasing the bandwidth to the Internet is done. I am going to say it is done for now. There is an ever increasing need for bandwidth so right now we are doing okay on that. Reviewing telephone dial tone. Our telephone Centrex contract with Verizon will be coming up in January 2008 so we are starting now to review the options for the City. Our first vendor conferences on this are in January. What we will do is talk to most any phone vendors, whether it be voice override key or traditional phones and look at pricing and performance and capabilities so come a year from now we will be making decisions based on solid research and analysis. I did want to touch base to on a couple of unplanned projects just so you know what happens. We have our plans when we put our budgets together on what we are going to be doing but then things come up that for whatever reason we aren't aware of that we still have to address. One of the

things we have done this year was move Police dispatch, which entailed us moving everybody out of Police dispatch into a temporary dispatch area at Police and then they redid the dispatch center and we moved everybody back. That included moving PC's and telephones and other equipment that was in there. There was no perceived downtime from any of the users calling in so that went well and that one is done. The new parking system...while most of that is web based, they do have a PC and software. There is service software so we came up with a server for them to run it on and then there are discussions about them maybe moving so we are not sure where that will be but that is not something that we had on our projects but we will take care of whatever their needs are to the best of our ability. The next item is connecting MCTV to the EOC as I noticed was on a later part of the agenda. What happened here is after the Mother's Day flooding and there was discussion that they should be able to broadcast from EOC we were just finishing up the grant fiber installation so we contacted Grace Sullivan from MCTV and said we might be able to help you with the fiber so we went out with them and their engineers and they are going to be using the fiber that we put in last year so they can broadcast from either the EOC in the main fire station or the back-up EOC. We have Gilbane e-mail discovery. This is part of the ongoing Gilbane lawsuit. There was a very extensive discovery request for e-mail, including my two hour deposition and we have a staff person who will be meeting with 13 employees of the City helping them get all of their e-mail together so the City can comply with that e-mail discovery request. That is ongoing right now. Then we also have a request for public wireless access for the Library. Our library is the largest public municipal library in the state and most libraries have Internet hot spots. Ours does not so we are working with them. This would be kind of a joint venture where some of the costs would be shared. They are looking at trustee money for the access and we are looking at technology upgrade money for the equipment so together we will be able to get this done for them. Those are the projects that we are working on right now that weren't on the books when we put the budget together.

Ms. Prew stated the point we just wanted to show here is that projects come forth every year that we don't anticipate and we need to be ready to respond to those needs because they are definitely important things that need to get done. That does have an effect both on our regular schedule and it also has an effect on what funds might be available. The last thing that we wanted to talk about are our concerns for the coming year. One of the first things we are certainly concerned with is maintaining reliable services for the City and keeping what we have up and running so that our departments can get their daily work done. A new wrinkle that will be added to this next year is with the new computer-aided dispatching and records management system. There will be a 24/7 component that we will have to deal with. We will have to work out with Police and Fire and ourselves that people are on-call should there be a problem at any time. 365 days a year

someone will have to be able to respond to them. So we will be addressing that. There will be some staffing issues with that and possibly some costs associated with that. We will have to see how that works out. We also...with our reliability we have put a great deal of effort into creating back-up capabilities with the Rines Center and being able to duplicate equipment so that if we do have problems we can respond very quickly. There are costs associated with that. It is kind of like an insurance policy that you have. I will say that we have certainly made use of it in the past. Fortunately, we haven't had any major issues but if something happens such as the Health Department fire we may be called on to use these kinds of capabilities. There are costs associated with it and I think that is something that perhaps in a later presentation Jennie can talk to you about. If we are faced with the budget cuts that we have seen in the past year, the City may have to make some decisions as to whether they want to continue that kind of an operation. That is something that I think this Committee needs to give some serious consideration to. We also...given the situation we are in right now we had concerns about completing our projects in a timely fashion. We certainly will continue to go through the list and work on them as quickly as we can but there is a certain amount of manpower that is needed to do the work and with less manpower it does go more slowly so you have to evaluate the impact that that has on the City also. Lastly, are there sufficient resources? That is always a question of funding. I did mention somewhat that we anticipate that our fixed costs will go up because we are constantly adding new applications as the departments need. There are costs that come along with that. Now when we budget for that we do do zero based budgeting. We look at each application that we have and talk with the vendors on what the costs are and we evaluate if we can do without that application. This year we were able to eliminate a few items but a majority of that funding is necessary. Again as I said HTE is \$166,000. The public safety will be \$120,000 a year. So those are costs that will need to be addressed.

Ms. Angell stated I would like to say that what we hope to do is have a dialogue with you on going to present some of these options to you so together we can decide what the City wants to do and what is important. That is what I was hoping to do in the next couple of months. We are getting right into budgets and it is not fair to you to expect you to make choices if we don't give you the information so I would like to ask now if it is possible to come back at your next meeting and you can decide what you would like us to present. We will keep it short and simple and this way together we can make appropriate choices for the resources that we have.

Alderman Lopez asked did I miss it. In reference to the motor vehicle program you said effective January 1. Which one are we using out of the three that you gave?

Ms. Prew answered we haven't made a selection yet and we have...I believe there is an extension on that January 1 date no matter what option we were to select and the state does realize that unless we were to use their system as it is. I think there is a clear understanding that that is not going to work for us so really the choices are between purchasing a new system or investing the 12 – 18 months to integrate our existing system so that is where the evaluation is right now.

Alderman Lopez stated we surely don't want to go with Option 3 with no registration notices and no parking tickets, etc. That would be a disaster for us.

Ms. Prew responded that is not a good choice for us and as I said we are not alone in that. Nashua and Keene and Concord have similar problems.

Alderman Lopez asked how long of an extension did the state give us.

Ms. Prew answered I think it is somewhat open ended at this point. The state really doesn't want us to go away because if we do they would have to collect all of those registrations and they are not really prepared for that either. It is something that we are working on together.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that at some point before they come down and say give us an effective date we should know something at least for next year's budget.

Ms. Prew responded that is certainly our goal.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't quite understand some of this but the IBM I-series computer V5R2 to V5R3 is there a cost involved there.

Ms. Prew replied the upgrades are part of the continuing maintenance that we pay so there is not a specific charge for that. It is just that it is a fairly intensive process for us to go through.

Alderman Lopez stated in looking at this report there are a lot of things in here and I appreciate everything that you put in here to document but I am going back to Page 6 and Page 8 from the departments of all of the things that they need to get done and I see that we have 38 different types of systems programming projects.

Ms. Prew responded Page 5 through 8 are the systems that are currently operational that we are supporting. Those aren't new projects. That is what is currently being supported by the applications and programming people.

Alderman Lopez asked so we do track everything like dog licensing, a \$16,000 license and 23,000 dog owners. That is all in the system now?

Ms. Prew answered yes that is all there right now.

Alderman Lopez stated okay this is great. I misread it then. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. The person on military leave, is he in Iraq or where is he?

Ms. Angell replied actually I think he might be in Rhode Island.

Ms. Prew responded he has been overseas.

Ms. Angell replied he was in a number of places but I think right now he is in Rhode Island.

Alderman Lopez asked when is he due back.

Ms. Angell answered his orders go through September 2007.

Alderman Lopez asked the unplanned projects, did you make a cost analysis. You didn't have those planned so did you look at a cost analysis?

Ms. Angell answered there are some things that we don't have a lot of option on. The discovery for Gilbane we don't have an option. We did do costing on that because what they originally requested was very, very costly and we did get some outsourcing costs but we don't have a choice. The whole parking thing is a very political thing and it is not a huge amount of time but it is time and we don't want to hold up the process for something that the Board has made evident is very important to them so we try to accommodate those things.

Alderman Lopez stated as you move forward as you indicated keep the dialogue open with us and give us some type of priority as to where we should be going and cost factors.

Alderman Forest stated I have two questions. One, the LAN person did you say you were in the process of interviewing that person or did we cut that out.

Ms. Prew responded the LAN Administrator, if all goes well, will be coming back to us on Monday.

Alderman Forest stated the other question I have and I don't know whether you can answer that Diane or if Frank can but the water problem and possibly another facility, has that been discussed or are you in the process of discussing that at all.

Ms. Prew replied it is my understanding, and I will let Mr. Thomas speak to this, but I believe they feel that the water problem has been solved.

Alderman Forest stated I understand that but it was said originally when it happened the first time and it happened again so I am just wondering if someone is looking forward to finding you another place.

Ms. Prew responded I can safely speak for the staff that they would love to have a facility with some windows. I am not aware of anything that is actively being discussed at this point.

Frank Thomas Public Works Director, stated we are reasonably confident that we solved that problem but there are no guarantees in life. As far as a new facility, no there isn't anything that has been identified.

Chairman O'Neil stated I want to thank you both and again, Diane, wish you all the best in retirement.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Leo Bernier, City Clerk, submitting suggestions relative to issues regarding the placement of political signage throughout the City.

Carol Johnson, Deputy City Clerk, stated good evening Chairman and members of the Committee. I am here to report back to you on Leo's behalf. It is my understanding that there was a lengthy discussion at the last meeting regarding political signage both throughout the City and at the polling places and what Leo did was go back and kind of look at the laws and tried to come up with a proposal that he thought might meet what the Committee was asking for. In the meantime I held a discussion this evening with Mr. Arnold and there are some loopholes in the proposals that Leo had presented you. Political signage really is controlled through state law, as well as the court or section that was mentioned at the last meeting. So in order to really address anything of any major satisfaction probably to members of the Board and to the community at large I think is going to require some legislative changes at the state level. The state requires right now under law that there is only a 10' corridor. Obviously people cannot interfere in the polling process but it is a public process and signage and holding signs, as I understand it, cannot be banned at the polling place by law the way it is written presently and I

am not sure...I think you could back it up further or open the space more perhaps but I don't think that you are going to be able to do a whole lot of anything without a change in the law because the law does say 10'. In terms of making that equal across each of the polling places, I think the Moderators attempt to do that to some degree because each polling place has a unique set-up. Moderators cannot spend the whole day outside. Moderators are very busy inside, particularly on a Presidential election. It is all they can do to handle the numbers and the crowds in the polling places because our polling places are very large. They are some of the largest in the country in terms of the voter population. Many communities limit their polling places to 2,500 registered voters for instance. So to ask a Moderator to go out there and make sure or have someone that is working in the polling place make sure that somebody doesn't leave a sign behind and those sorts of things...they can go out and maybe intermittently check at most elections. Some elections I don't even think they will get out there once during the day to be honest with you. What used to happen years ago when we had a larger budget for elections is we had police officers at all of the polling places. Now what we do is request police officers and pay for details only for traffic issues, particularly at the schools. So that is something that the Moderators used to have at their disposal to keep some of the crowd control and some of those other issues under control but they don't have that at their disposal anymore. It is all they can do to find workers to work inside the polls as many of you know because I am sure you all get calls asking if you know of anybody. In Leo's proposal, in the first instance you can...the law actually says that nobody can place political signage in right-of-ways or on public property without permission. The private property you can't regulate but certainly you can with the public property. To my understanding I don't believe the City allows it. We certainly don't and I think the campaigns are generally made aware of that. The only accountability for that really is to go back again to the state law and the state law provides that nobody shall do it but if you don't catch them in the act it is tied to the person and not to the party so unless you change something in the law again you are not really going to be able to address that much better. The deposits...requiring the deposits of candidates we thought that might be a good answer. It is my understanding that the Solicitor may have some concerns with that and the authority to do that might have to be added to the current law at the state level. In terms of the third option, that really only comes into play after an election. Again, it would be tied to who left them and how do you determine who has done that. The laws were changed to allow maintenance people to be able to remove the signs and stack them up and I know the Highway Department has attempted to do that on a regular basis and I guess the real answer here is whether or not the Board wants to, at some point, provide additional funding or something to address what ends up in the right-of-ways or what is happening at the polling places by providing additional monies to cover the police time. I guess with that I will answer questions if you have them.

Alderman Forest stated I understand what you said and I guess some of us who are duly elected representatives will have to address that at the state level. There is one here and the other three items I guess Solicitor Arnold can answer those but there is one here, City Ordinance 91.75, which is Posting of Notices. That could probably be included, the political signs could probably be included in this, but there are private entities and private businesses all over the City right now – these 800 numbers and going out of business sales and all of that that are not being enforced either. That is one of the other things that is going on. I assume the Police Department can do it but they are busy with other things. We did give the authority to the Highway Department to pick up some signs during the political process and from what I understand that person is now retired. I am not sure if Frank is going to hire somebody just to pick up signs. We do have to come up with a solution to this. It is terrible all over the City. It costs, between the Highway Department and Parks & Recreation this political season, \$5,000+ and I don't think we should be footing this bill. Other than that, I think I will just refer the other questions to the City Solicitor.

Alderman Smith stated I brought this up because of the incident at Parker-Varney School, which you have a copy of but the RSA states “no political advertisement shall be placed or affixed to any public property, including highway right-of-ways or private property without the owner's consent.” I would suggest that we go with the state and say that no one can affix anything in the City right-of-way. Now if a property owner wants to give somebody the right to place a sign on his property that is all well and good but nothing should be in the right-of-way and the only thing I can say is if you went to the West Side on Queen City Avenue up to South Willow Street and then down on Canal Street it was a disaster. I didn't know where I was. There must have been about 150 signs. I think that we should do something like that if we have to change it but it says “no political advertisement” and yet the only one that can do it is the state representative or the Highway Department. I am getting sick and tired of these signs being put all over the place. Some people are handicapped and they can't even use the public sidewalk because the signs are right there on the dirt sidewalk. I wish that we would address this. I am sick and tired of these political signs and the quicker we get rid of them, the better off we are going to be. Thank you.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied in response to that the provision that I was referring to in terms of holding accountability, the law does provide that they cannot affix it to public property without permission and certainly we don't give them permission but the problem is holding them accountable and you can't hold the campaign office accountable or the person campaigning under this law. The Police would have to find the person putting the sign in physically and that is when they could do something for enforcement. That is why I am saying perhaps the state law needs to address those enforcement and accountability issues.

Alderman Smith stated my suggestion and I don't know how true it is and you could probably get into a battle with that but I think any citizen, if it is in a right-of-way and it is illegal can pick up the sign. Right now it can't. It is restricted to two agencies and if somebody was outside their house, like let's say I live in Boynton Street and there are signs on my sidewalk, I can pick them up and throw them away. This is what I am trying to get at. It was really ridiculous.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the City doesn't have the authority to change the state law. We need to go to the state for those changes.

Alderman Smith stated I would advise the City Solicitor to look into this so we can move on this. We can't just be pacifying everybody. We have to do something and put this bed once and for all.

Alderman Lopez stated I guess the problem here is who enforces it. That is the number one issue. We don't have a Compliance Officer. We have a Building Department and they won't do anything until they get a complaint and the Highway Department won't do anything until they get a complaint yet there is a fine under RSA 47:17 it says "a separate offense shall be deemed committed upon each day during the violation" and I would venture to say nobody has been fined in all of these years. I don't know. I am just making that statement. I guess it is the enforcement aspect of it. Knowing that it is a difficult situation and the filing date up there I think is all over with isn't it.

Alderman Forest asked what.

Alderman Lopez answered the filing date for the reps to do something this year.

Alderman Forest replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated so that is all over with and now we have to wait another year.

Alderman Forest stated it is not too late to file for the following year and I think Alderman Long and I are already talking about doing it.

Chairman O'Neil stated you can amend an existing bill that is introduced if it is germane with the subject.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I am sure there is some before the Election Law Committee that could be looked at is my guess.

Alderman Lopez stated I was going to suggest in the meantime with a Compliance Officer or Enforcement Officer or whatever you want to call him, when people do register that are a candidate or campaign headquarters or Friends of so and so and all of that, that maybe we should send some type of special letter to that candidate asking them from refrain from putting signs on public property. I don't know if we do that. Do we Carol?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded it depends on the election. In the local elections we usually will give them some campaign literature at that time and it includes the laws relating to both campaign finances and other ones that we consider applicable and we could certainly include it in that package. In the instance of state elections or federal elections, which are probably bigger problems for us actually than the local elections, those candidates don't typically file in our office so in order to do that we would have to get further information from the Secretary of State's Office and compile a list of anybody that would be running in any district that was within our community. Because the filing is not with us, we would not have a listing of the names and addresses.

Alderman Lopez replied there are a lot of things we can do. We can make a news release to the paper and say hey...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected I think that we attempted to do some of that. Perhaps we can do more in terms of marketing the idea that this shouldn't be done and certainly I can bring that message back to Leo and ask that he try to make that more of a public knowledge.

Alderman Smith stated even in my ward today there are signs and there are political signs all over the City still. I thought 10 days after the election they were supposed to be removed? I don't have a right to do it. That is what I am getting at.

Alderman Lopez asked who enforces that if I may ask.

Alderman Forest answered the Building Department.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I believe the Board also indicated that Highway could pick up anything in right-of-ways as well. They actually turned it over to the Highway Department the last time because the Building Department was not responding quickly enough and Highway is out on the street everyday. At this point they don't have to give notice or store them anywhere. Because the time has gone by they can pick them up and throw them in the back of a garbage truck.

Alderman Lopez stated they should be removed. If it is on public property or in the right-of-way or on a telephone pole it should be removed.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated if it is on private property at this point even I believe the Police Department could enforce that law.

Alderman Lopez stated right so maybe we should just send a notice to the Police Department and make them aware of it.

Chairman O'Neil asked does anyone want to take an action on this.

Alderman Smith stated I think some action should be taken. I would suggest that the City Solicitor move on this and get some of our local representatives to try and get this RSA changed a little bit. My suggestion would be that no one be allowed to put any political signs in a right-of-way. In other words, if a private citizen wants to put something on his private property, fine, but if it is a right-of-way maintained by the property owner and the City they can't put signs on it.

Chairman O'Neil stated we need to send this someplace.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to refer this item to the City Solicitor.

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated I would like some clarification. I am not sure after the discussion what you expect my office to do.

Alderman Smith replied I will discuss it with you.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Grace Sullivan, MCTV Director, requesting video origination points be connected at the Emergency Operations Center and Health Department and change the Verizon and Ash Street School to Memorial and West High Schools noting additional costs would be funded by the municipal Comcast cable grant.

Alderman Forest moved to approve the request. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated Grace, the only question I have is...I understand Ash Street but why Verizon. Why are you changing Verizon?

Grace Sullivan, MCTV, stated in regards to the equating...right now we have Gill Stadium hooked up, which is Central's home field and we have JFK, which is the arena. What West and Memorial would do is equate the three high school facilities that we have. Verizon we only use three times a year for graduations so they are very exciting having run camera at graduation this year but when you think about the amount of events that are at Memorial and West compared to three graduations we would rather...well the Board of School Committee would rather have Memorial and West than Ash and Verizon.

Chairman O'Neil asked Verizon could always be taped correct.

Dr. Sullivan answered we do tape them yes.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Manchester Community Access Media (MCAM)
requesting allocation of a fourth PEG channel.

Chairman O'Neil stated there was a communication to them that there was going to be no presentation this evening. I hope they got that. The allocation of the four channels kind of brings something forward that came up many years ago but we never hit the threshold for the first channel to have this discussion. One has to do with the ability and I remember I sat on a cable contract in the late 80's where there was a lot of discussion for the ability of the City to use one of these channels for training. We have never taken advantage of it. We have never looked at the opportunity to do that. I can remember discussions on...specifically with the Fire Department and I think Bob Dakotas was the Chief then where as you may or may not be aware many times during the course of a week the Fire Department brings in a significant number of firefighters on duty to conduct training at the central location. Back 20 years ago there was discussion about utilizing a channel to conduct training so the firefighters would not have to leave the firehouses. We have always concentrated on the PEG philosophy – public, education and government with the three channels and there has never been a formal discussion about a fourth channel for training. The Fire Department is one example. There could be other examples that I am not even aware of. Secondly, I think since 9/11 there is a need to communicate with the public when incidents are going on in the City. I think of the wind storm last winter. I think of the floods and I think there needs to be a discussion within City government is there a need for that fourth channel. Does it need to be made available for public safety purposes, including Police, Fire and Health? Again, we have never been at the point to have a discussion about the fourth channel. It is my opinion that those discussions need

to happen before we put it out for anything else and I don't know how the rest of the Committee feels about that.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it is important to find out from the staff...I know one of the things that I was interested in a few years ago was the capability of the Mayor or department heads to be able to communicate with all of the City employees at one time and the Health Department at the same time having some real health issues that could be on a channel like this. Now whether it is needed or not that is where I am. I don't know. I think you are right in saying that the staff should give us some recommendation as to whether this fourth channel is going to be something that the City side under MCTV is going to need in order to educate the public on health issues and training so people don't have to leave their particular location in order to get the training. Until I have that answer from staff, I am willing to go along with you. I just don't want to make the wrong decision in just giving up the fourth channel just like that.

Alderman Forest stated I may be wrong but I was under the impression that there was also a fifth channel. Is that correct?

Chairman O'Neil responded there is a threshold...I can't speak...I don't know if Mr. Arnold or Dr. Sullivan can answer that.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated there is the ability, once you meet certain qualifications, to get a fifth channel under our cable television renewal franchise. The qualifications are a little different than the fourth channel. In order to get a fifth channel you have to provide that the four channels are being programmed as original, non-duplicative locally produced programming 75% of the time during available Comcast hours in a three-month period. Now Comcast hours under the agreement are from 10 AM until 10 PM so there is a threshold that needs to be met but there is the ability once you meet that threshold to get a fifth channel. In terms of the discussions that have taken place so far in terms of training and items like that, I would note that the channels we are talking about under the franchise agreement basically are channels that go out to all cable subscribers in the City of Manchester and, therefore, might not be appropriate to use for training purposes or internal purposes within the City.

Chairman O'Neil asked Tom then why did we have those discussions many contracts ago.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I think that may have been and as I say relying on my memory is often dangerous but under the prior contract there were provisions for the build out and use of an Intranet, which is separate and apart and

from the cable channels. There was some discussion of using that Intranet for those training purposes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I agree with Alderman Lopez. I would like to get some answers to some of these questions. Once we make the move on this we are committed and we can't look back then. A year from now or two years from now or five years from now a future Board could say well jeez I wish they would have taken a look at all options and that is all I am asking to do. If it is not needed and it is not necessary then I am fine with moving forward.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I would certainly agree that some strategic planning so to speak ought to take place with regard to the fourth and fifth channels.

Alderman Forest stated I don't think I am ready to vote on this tonight. I know I have some concerns and I don't believe it is appropriate because of what we are discussing tonight. I think it is an entirely different matter and I think it is something that I can discuss privately with MCAM and MCTV. I am not sure what kind of motion I would make. Maybe to table this so we can get more information so we don't make a hasty decision tonight. I am not ready to vote on this.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would think the proper motion would be to refer it to City staff to coordinate with MCTV. I am especially interested in the public safety services – Police, Fire and Health. I would also like to know more about the opportunities for training. Tom may be absolutely right but I don't know that. I can only go back to my memory a number of cable contracts ago. You can include HR, Airport, Information, Clerk, Solicitor...I don't care what other City departments need to get involved but I want to see a discussion to go on and I want it to be well thought out and I want a report back with recommendations.

Alderman Forest stated I have talked to a couple of MCAM producers about this and I did make them aware that I was not prepared to vote and I wasn't going to make any guarantees to them. If Tricia remembers what the motion is, I will move that motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated it would be to send this to City staff. I don't want this to drag on forever.

Alderman Forest replied I know it has been dragging because this has been on the agenda for awhile.

Chairman O'Neil stated I did talk to Joe way back when this thing started and said there were some issues of great importance that we had to address like this whole Central Purchasing issue and P-Cards, etc. that were going to take this Committee's attention through most of the fall and it has. We are going to talk about it again tonight. If there is no further discussion, I would entertain a motion to have this referred to City staff and to report back as soon as possible with a good thorough review of the City's need for that channel.

Deputy Clerk Piecuch asked you said City staff. Should we include MCTV and MCAM personnel?

Chairman O'Neil answered well they are not really City staff.

Deputy Clerk Piecuch stated the Solicitor is advising that we include MCAM personnel.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is fine.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I was just noting that they are not City staff but I thought their input might be helpful.

Chairman O'Neil replied a representative from MCAM. I don't want this to be a show folks. I want to make that perfectly clear. I am not going to go through what we went through with the war between MCTV and MCAM. That is not what this is about. We spent a lot of time on that back some years ago. This is about whether or not there is a need for the City to have a fourth channel.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. Arnold are you going to lead that or is MCTV going to lead.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I was going to try to avoid it but I think that Grace and I could work together and reach out to appropriate staff to see who would like to participate.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Forest stated one more comment before we vote. I know my wife called me and John I think you have a message on my machine and I will return your phone call.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote to refer the item to City staff to report back to the Committee with recommendations on whether the City has a need for a fourth PEG channel. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Continuing discussions regarding centralized purchasing administration, fleet management and various communications received from the Finance Department (items enclosed) as follows:

- a) original communications and report from Finance regarding purchasing activities in comparable cities;
- b) cell phone/pager analysis submitted by Finance (departmental responses enclosed);
- c) centralized purchasing for printing needs submitted by Finance (city staff recommends proceeding to the next step to include assessment and analysis of the city's needs);
- d) W. B. Mason Analysis submitted by Finance;
- e) P-card vendor list;
- f) P-card Analysis and Performance Tracking Sheet submitted by Finance;
- g) departmental responses regarding centralized purchasing.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we have items a through g listed. I'm not sure where you want to begin. We did notify the departments and request a second response in terms of Central Purchasing and cell phones and I know that there were several responses to that.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to just share a conversation I had today with the Mayor in trying to move this forward and bring some closure or at least some direction to it. The Mayor suggested that of all the documents we received that probably Mr. Thomas' letter of October 4th might be the one to have further discussion on. Frank made some observations, some recommendations and confirmed some of Mr. Dillon's statements and it would be my recommendation on further discussion happen between the Mayor and some City staff on that letter. I don't know if you folks have it. Maybe we can get that to the Committee. It doesn't talk about a full centralized purchasing program but it talks about there's some ways that City departments can work together. I'm very much generalizing and the Mayor said he is willing to...

Alderman Forest asked so Mr. Chairman, do we need a motion to do something?

Chairman O'Neil stated what I would like to do is the Mayor did ask to have a discussion with the respective City departments but he did reference that he thought Mr. Thomas's recommendation might be an appropriate way to go. I don't want to speak for the Mayor. We had a brief conversation about it but it

would bring some movement, some closure in some parts on this. It is more just setting up a system. I think one of Frank's recommendations is having a system with Mindy and Lisa that just kind of coordinates opportunities for other departments to use. I would ask...the holidays are coming up. I don't know if they will have a chance to meet and report back in a month but report back as soon as possible.

Alderman Forest stated there are some department heads, I understand, that are here to speak on this.

Chairman O'Neil asked on the general concept?

Alderman Forest responded on I think some specifics...

Chairman O'Neil stated no, I think a lot of them are here tonight to talk about a specific thing that came up at the last meeting. Does anybody differ with what I just said? I know there is a specific issue of...is it SPC is the discussion we had and I think that is where a lot of them want to talk. With that I would entertain a motion that we refer Mr. Thomas's letter of October 4 with some recommendations...again it references, I think, Mr. Dillon. I don't want to speak for him, but I think he concurred with a lot of the recommendations in there and I think some of the other departments have agreed and this might allow some movement. It's from October 4th. Frank presented it at one of the several hundred Central Purchasing meetings we've had so...If you don't have it we will make sure the Clerk gets it out but everybody should have it.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is attached to the agenda this evening. It is Item 8 a) 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Chairman O'Neil stated if any of the department heads want to be involved in those discussions that is fine but the Mayor did indicate that today that he thought Frank's letter would bring some movement and some closure to this. Well done Mr. Thomas.

Alderman Forest moved to table.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't know if we need to table it.

Alderman Lopez stated I guess the Mayor is going to solve it with the department heads. Is that what basically the...

Chairman O'Neil replied he asked for the consideration that we allow him to sit down and talk to them about this.

Alderman Lopez stated and if they can't come to a conclusion with some of the recommendations for Central Purchasing, whether it be at the Highway Department or in connection with the individuals at the Finance Department and Highway Department then it comes back to this Committee.

Chairman O'Neil answered absolutely. I don't know if we need to table it. We can just refer it.

Alderman Smith stated these are documents on Central Purchasing and it seems like every meeting we go...some people have change their opinions but most of the departments are not for Central Purchasing. We have beat this to the ground. It is like playing games. If you don't get it the first time, try a second time. As you well know I am against Central Purchasing for several reasons. Like I said I have enough documentation from way back in May and from the Accounts Committee in 2005 and 2006 on the same subject presented by Finance and I think it is time to put this to bed.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think, and I don't want to speak for Frank, we keep referencing Central Purchasing but what I read in Frank's letter and in comments I've heard is yes there is opposition to Central Purchasing. Maybe it is called Coordinated Purchasing or maybe it is called something else. I don't know. Central Purchasing may not be the proper term but what I have heard from the departments is there is a willingness to participate if there are opportunities on common items of interest to the respective departments. They have all said they are interested in getting involved in that. They are not looking to create another layer of government but if there is a way to coordinate, whether it be automotive or vehicle equipment and supplies or common paper goods that you might buy from Staples or W.B. Mason, they are interested in that if we have a mechanism for somebody to work out those agreements. They are interested in that.

Alderman Lopez stated I am just wondering...just on a second thought if this is going to go to Frank Thomas, which is under the ordinance now, why don't we just let him come back in six months and tell us exactly where to go or in three months. I am just wondering if you are going to have two different bosses for the employees in Central Purchasing whether that is going to work.

Chairman O'Neil asked where are the two separate...?

Alderman Lopez answered well one over at the Highway Department and one at the Finance Department.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think if you look in Frank's recommendation, he recommends Mindy and Lisa under the same roof I think.

Alderman Lopez replied if that is the recommendation, which I didn't read, why don't we just do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated and I don't want to speak for Frank but the other thing that is in his recommendation is the P-cards is the responsibility of the Finance Department and let that happen with the staff at the Finance Department.

Alderman Lopez asked I am wondering if we are going to get the full value of the 40 hours a week by having two bosses. I am concerned with that.

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, answered I am not sure what you mean by two bosses. Under the proposal that was kind of drafted in this letter on the second and third page, basically I note that there is somewhat of a consensus that it does make sense to do some central purchasing functions as Alderman O'Neil mentioned. I think it would be easy enough to go out and bid out the Staples catalog so that everybody can buy paper products out of one catalog. What is being proposed here is Lisa, who is in the Finance Department, would come down to the Highway Department and work with Mindy who is our Purchasing Agent now. Those two people would more or less take care of purchasing but under the Highway Department. As Alderman O'Neil mentioned, what we are saying is that VISA cards or P-cards have always been under the realm of the Finance Department and there are supposed to be savings in not needing to process as many checks so what I am saying is let's leave the P-cards under Finance and let the Finance Department administer that operation similar to the way they administered the VISA card operation. Take Lisa and Mindy, again, move them under me. As they put out bids that could be utilized by other departments they would. As mentioned things like automotive bids we put them out now. We can go around and have these two people ask other departments for input so they can add to our bidding and these two people would continue to have a dialogue with say your Committee here in order to put together standardization as far as purchasing forms, RFP's, and contracts. The point that Kevin Dillon had made at one of his presentations and I picked up on that is let's try to tie together things that make sense to tie together and let's keep separate things that make sense to keep separate. Like you shouldn't be trying to standardize or do central purchasing for things that are uniquely for the Manchester-Boston Regional Airport and the same for the Highway Department, Water Works and whatnot.

Alderman Lopez stated I am all for moving forward tomorrow with that concept.

Mr. Thomas responded well I haven't heard this conversation but I think what the Mayor is saying is he sees some potential positives in what is recommended or suggested by myself in this letter and maybe he just wants to sit down with myself and maybe Kevin Dillon or some of the other larger department that does a lot of purchasing and maybe work out some of the details, etc.

Chairman O'Neil stated again Central Purchasing may not be the proper title.

Alderman Lopez responded right and then recommendations would come back from the department on any policy changes or whatever the case may be. That to me makes sense.

Alderman Smith stated I have three letters here today that we just received that they were opposed against Central Purchasing. Now Frank's concept and what he is saying now is not Central Purchasing. I mean he is not going to purchase a fire truck or anything else. I don't want to go full Central Purchasing. I opposed it from the beginning. We used to have a fleet manager here as everybody recalls and that didn't work out. Everybody assumes that you are going to have cost savings but every department operates differently. They have different types of machinery and different types of equipment and that is why I am dead set against it. Like right here we have one from the Library and one from the City Clerk all opposing the concept of Central Purchasing. If you want to give it another name, fine. I have no problem with that but if you are going to go through with Central Purchasing I am dead set against it.

Chairman O'Neil replied my suggestion is that we move this forward, give the Mayor the opportunity to sit down with Mr. Thomas and if some of the others who have spoken strongly about this would like to join that meeting, fine, and report back as soon as possible on it and we can start moving forward and bring some closure to this. Again, Frank has also recommended as part of this, keep in mind, that the P-card program continue with the Finance Department. We don't have any motions right?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered no you don't and I think you have some people that wanted to discuss the centralized copying as well as part of that because there are concerns about a contract out there.

Chairman O'Neil stated but that is not part of what I am trying to do in moving Mr. Thomas's letter forward for his discussion with the Mayor. We can separately have the discussion about the photocopiers and printers and all of that. To me they are two separate issues.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I just want to make sure that is clarified.

Mr. Thomas stated I didn't know about the copier proposal when I put this document together and I think you are right. The copier issue is a specific item that has been placed on the table for coordinating purchase power.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't know. If you want to put it on the table to allow Mr. Thomas and others to meet with the Mayor, that's fine. Carol, do we have to take some action, table it, or can we just bring it up next month?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered my suggestion would be that if you want it to come back next month as a report you could do that. You could refer it to the Mayor and Mr. Thomas to come back with a report to the Committee next month.

Alderman Forest moved to refer the recommendations regarding Central Purchasing to the Mayor and Frank Thomas who will come back to the Committee with a report at the next meeting.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question for Mr. Thomas. I understand where Alderman Smith is going. In what you are going to do there is no authority to go to these departments that have objections and change anything. Is that correct?

Mr. Thomas replied again I think what I am hearing is that a formal proposal on how we are going to do this is going to come back to your committee after I or a group of staff people meet with the Mayor and firm up a proposal, put it in black and white and come back to you. Again, the way I envision this operation running is that certain things...if we put out a...you can bid catalogs. W.B. Mason. You can put out a bid so that W.B. Mason and Staples and anybody else can bid their catalog. They give us a price plus a markdown. Then somebody in the central purchasing function, if you want to call it that, would award the bid for the materials in these catalogs to say W.B. Mason.

Chairman O'Neil stated I like the phrase you just used – purchasing operations. That gets us away from Central Purchasing.

Mr. Thomas stated and then you would be able to make available this low bid to all the other departments. They wouldn't have to come back to us. They would be able to call up W.B. Mason and order goods any way they want and they would get the discount and the guaranteed delivery time and whatnot. As far as automotive bids again, say if the Police Station gives us a list of tires that they want to include in our bid, and our bid that we put out for automotive products comes in cheaper than what they can buy, they would buy off our bid. They would go through our vendor. They wouldn't need to come through us. They could go directly to the vendor. Now if they can buy the tire somewhere cheaper

and it has gone through some kind of procurement process, fine. They are not being locked in. What I am proposing is areas that make sense we should try to get a bid that everyone can take advantage of. That is what these two people would be doing. In addition, there could be some standardization. The Highway Department has bidding documents that are tried and true. The Airport Authority has bidding documents that are tried and true. I am sure Water Works does. We can put those documents in electronic form so that other departments can take advantage of it. RFP's and this and that. Where we are putting out RFP's and bids all of the time I think the larger departments have a little bit more expertise than some of the smaller departments. I think there is an ability to take some of our expertise and maybe in electronic form and allow other departments to go with it. As far as continuing the dialogue with this Committee, if six months or a year down the road we have a proposal like you are going to talk about tonight regarding the copiers, that would go through these two individuals in our department and then come back to you for a recommendation. We would look at trying to save money but not do it at the expense of a true Central Purchasing. True Central Purchasing, the way I understand it would work, you almost have to submit a requisition into Central Purchasing to buy that pad of paper that you want.

Alderman Lopez stated I guess my final question to make sure I completely understand it is...and I understand everything you said up to this point. By giving you that authority if a department head, let's say the Manchester City Library for example since I am looking it, they would just go to you for advice in reference to this but you wouldn't be telling them that they had to do something.

Mr. Thomas replied not unless this Committee at a later time...say we do put out a bid for paper products and it is W.B. Mason. There may be a directive that the Library has to buy their paper and pencils through W.B. Mason because they are the cheapest vendor that we have. On the other side of the coin, they would not be coming to this operation to buy books for their library.

Alderman Lopez asked so it would be a purchasing operation then, right? That's the terminology, I think.

Mr. Thomas answered that is fine if you don't like Central Purchasing.

Alderman Lopez stated well Alderman Smith doesn't like it and a few other people don't like it.

Chairman O'Neil stated coordinated purchasing. I don't know what the right phrase is but Central Purchasing is not going to...it's not going to pass here, a full Central Purchasing. There are not enough votes. There are not even close to

enough votes to do it. We need to move this. In my brief discussion this afternoon with the Mayor, he agreed that we need to move forward on this, try to attempt to bring some closure and that he thought Mr. Thomas's letter best reflected our opportunity to do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated there's been a motion by Alderman Forest. Is there a second?

Alderman Lopez asked what is the motion?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated my understanding is the motion was to refer the letter from Mr. Thomas to Mr. Thomas and the Mayor to discuss it with the departments and come back with a full report and a proposal.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Smith being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have...can we take...I don't know what we want to do on the cell phones. I would like to bring closure to that issue. The reports...I think the departments have done a great job. I think they have explained their various needs and why they have different levels of service. I think we should just clear that up. We've got one communication. What about the whole concept here? I have had discussions with just about every department head. Everybody has different needs. I think we saw the Airport...Kevin you have multiple contracts but they are to meet different guidelines of the FAA, the airlines, what they have to meet their...I'd like to see us just get the cell phone issue off the table, receive and file it.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to receive and file the cell phone issue.

Chairman O'Neil stated the one issue we do have that was presented to us at the last meeting was regarding copiers, printers, etc. Randy, I know we asked for several departments to get together. I believe that happened. I don't know if everybody was able to participate. I know that I have received several calls with concerns. Why don't you update us on where we're at.

Randy Sherman, Interim Finance Officer, stated we did have a meeting. Skip Tilton came down from SPC on November 30. We actually met during Fred Rusczek's retirement party. At the conclusion of that meeting I think all of the departments agreed that it would be a worthwhile process to go to the next step, which would be in essence the audit/analysis of our printing needs and possibly putting together the plan. That is really what I've submitted to you in the letter.

Since that time, a number of departments have obviously talked to Alderman O'Neil and talked to myself and we have some concerns over the standard contract that has been provided. We have concerns in Finance. The Solicitor has given me concerns. Info. Systems has given me concerns. I guess what I would like from the Committee tonight is sort of a general feel on whether it is worthwhile for us to sit down with Mr. Tilton and try to negotiate terms or just take this concept of trying to, again, go out and look to maybe group together our purchasing power for copiers and toners and those types of things and just kind of say no, let's just set that aside and let's not even go down that road. I think there is opportunity here. If all of the analysis that we have been provided from other school districts and cities holds true, I think there is the potential there for some substantial savings but again I think there are some contract issues that as staff we would like to have the opportunity to go back and spend some time and hammer out some of those issues. My proposal would be is again, that the same group of City departments would get together, would review the contract, make proposals and ultimately at the end of the day prior to any execution of a contract we would come back to this Committee and present that to you. I think clearly you want to make sure that all of the departments are on board on this one. It is something that cuts across every department. We all have copiers, we all have printers and I think truly everyone needs to feel comfortable that they're going to ultimately at the end of the day get what they are looking for and get the assurances and protections that they are looking for. Again, that's kind of what I'd like from this Committee. If you tell us to go and hammer out a contract we'll go do that to the best of our ability and bring it back to the Committee prior to execution.

Chairman O'Neil asked any questions or concerns? I know there's a couple of departments that wanted to speak on it this evening. Tricia, is it a joint...Jennie Angell and Tricia Piecuch. Randy, while they are getting set up I know Highway was not able to participate in the discussion and one of the reasons we wanted Highway was because they did large construction documents as does the Airport, as does the Water Works. I don't know if that changes anything at all?

Mr. Sherman responded I e-mailed, talked to Frank about it and Frank said he had seen the presentation and was happy moving on to the next step but clearly as we move into the contractual phrase we'll re-invite Highway.

Chairman O'Neil asked why do we need to have a contract to move into the next step when I am told others will provide the same service without a contract?

Mr. Sherman answered maybe they will. I don't know that Alderman. We just haven't gotten that far.

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we hear from Jennie and Tricia.

Tricia Piecuch, Deputy Clerk, stated we did meet and listen to Mr. Tilton and everything and heard what he had to say, which basically was the presentation that he made to the Committee. We did agree to go forward with the next step. But the thing being at that time we didn't have a contract. We did see the standard contract and we did have our concerns with that standard contract. In reviewing the minutes also from that last meeting, I have concerns because we have a few vendors in our office for our copiers because we have some at the Rines Center, we have some downstairs in Archives and then the copiers we have in our office. So we do have a few vendors. One of the vendors will not do business with SPC and I am very concerned about that because Mr. Tilton did state that he would strengthen those ties. He wouldn't sever those ties. If this company does not do business with SPC then what happens? Is the individual that is going to be coming in to service this copier if it doesn't need to be traded up or given to another department, will that individual know that machine? Will that individual be certified to fix that machine? I have some concerns there as to what vendors Mr. Tilton does do business with. A couple of other things that I have concerns on, if we are going out to have Mr. Tilton come in and do the analysis, I feel that we should have him do the analysis but also invite others to do the analysis because if we are going to be going out and, after looking at the analysis, contracting with this individual then we have the procurement code of the \$10,000. This will definitely be over \$10,000 if we start purchasing copiers. I know they are the ones that are going to go out to bid but that's again one individual that is going to be going out to bid to other companies. I feel we should have other individuals as well look into it. I do think it is a good plan and I think it is something that needs to be looked at but there are other companies that are willing to come in and do the analysis as well for free that have done it in the past for other organizations. I just have concerns as well as if they come in and they say okay we need to have this copier replaced but gee the Health Department can use this copier so now the City Clerk's Office needs a new copier but who is paying for that? The City Clerk or the Health Department? So there are definitely some concerns that I have currently going forward with this but like I said I think the concept is good and if it is a way to save money for the City I think it is a great plan to do. We have to, I think, slow down and do it step by step and if we are going to negotiate a new contract that's fine, but the contract as it sits right now I would be very concerned about. I'll let Jennie speak to printers or if Randy wants to comment on that.

Ms. Angell stated I, too, agree that I think there's probably some savings to be made doing some coordinated contract, putting contracts together. We might have 25 of a certain brand of copiers and we might have 25 contracts and that doesn't seem like the most cost effective. My biggest concern was, with the committee agreed to go forward but we didn't think we were committing the City to anymore

than \$400 and upon looking at the contract we were actually committing the City to five years so that is where the big concerns and the brakes...we need to slow down a little bit. In talking a little more with Skip on this process I do have a couple of concerns. He's got printers listed there. We do have a good handle on our printers. We know exactly what we have and where they are. I do agree that we don't have complete records of what the toner costs are on them, so there are a couple of departments that I have asked to start recording when the toner cartridges go in and take out so we can actually get costs on this. That will take about a month. Another thing with this particular vendor is there are certain brands, as Tricia said, copiers, but also the printers...the City has a standard printer. It is an HP printer. Not a standard printer but a standard manufacturer and that's because of their enterprise management reduces our cost for managing. This particular vendor does not...HP does not bid on his contracts so we are looking at either we're not going to being able to get HP printers from him or they will be at a higher cost. I do have a concern that needs to be looked at. I don't want to have to change the printer manufacturer we have because of a contract like this. If we change what we have for a printer I want it to be for a technical business reason. The other thing is on the copiers we have been testing copiers to do all of the technical functions that the City wants done. Right now we've got two manufacturers that do everything we need and one of those manufacturers as Tricia said won't bid through him so then we lose one of them. We can probably get more but I think we just need to go slow to make sure that we know what all of the ramifications are on this. As Randy had indicated in an e-mail earlier, we are not in complete agreement of what the terms are so we need to find out what they are so we're all on the same page.

Alderman Lopez stated Randy, when this gentleman made the presentation here it wasn't going to cost us a lot of money. I think maybe your suggestion...it might be appropriate that you sit down and all of the concerns from all of the departments...like I think they bring up a very good point that if you replace it who is going to replace it and who is going to pay for it and all of those things before things really move forward because the first meeting we had here it sounded simple but now I think it is complicated.

Mr. Sherman replied I totally agree. They have expressed concerns and we clearly hear their concerns and I think...part of the problem that we had...even Jennie and I going back and forth the last couple of days talking about this but it is he said this and I said well I heard it but I heard it this way and Tricia...until something is down on paper and everybody can read it and interpret it and knows exactly what it says...that is my point. I guess we would just like to go to that step. Clearly nobody's rushing this thing. We all have printers and we all have copiers and they are all up and running right now. We can, I think, take some time, go back, go through these issues, address certain things. We haven't heard from Tim or Frank

or even the Police Department who also participated. I think every department has their own needs and we have to make sure that they're all addressed as we go forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that that's a good suggestion to go back and coordinate with the departments and their major concerns and look at the contract and then give us some type of recommendation.

Mr. Sherman replied yes we will be coming back to the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to have staff go back, sit down and coordinate with the departments to address their major concerns, look at the contract and give some type of recommendation to the Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication requesting a banner for Catholic Schools Week be hung on Hanover Street.

Alderman Smith asked Mr. Arnold is this appropriate.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I would think you could do this. You would probably want to do it subject to your normal conditions – the approval of Police, Risk and Highway.

Chairman O'Neil stated Mr. Thomas informed me of something that there was an issue with one that we already approved and we probably should not be doing these anymore.

Mr. Thomas stated not the way that they were done in the past. There was a banner placed between two light poles by the Palace Theatre and that actually pulled over the two light poles. I believe that Jim Hoben had said somewhere along the line that they are looking at putting up some proper poles but before you give it a blanket okay it should be turned over to us for comments back because again the two street light poles were bent over.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated in the past they had determined that those poles could not be used for banners anymore and they were recommending that the two poles at Veteran's Park be utilized for those purposes until such time as there was funding to put up the proper poles.

Chairman O'Neil responded there was. We stopped doing it for a long time and somehow it kind of...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected I think the Palace came in recently and nobody caught it and it kind of went through.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would suggest that we refer this to the Highway Department but until we come up with a new system to do this if Hanover Street is the preferred location it is not going to be under our current set-up and we don't have the funds to construct something there that is appropriate.

Alderman Forest moved to refer the communication to the Highway Department. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried.

TABLED ITEM

9. Communication from Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, providing an update on the status of cable casting original points.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it was voted to remove Item 9 from the agenda.

Alderman Forest stated I have talked to Deputy Solicitor Arnold and I would like him to speak on this.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I think basically you have probably already taken care of this item as part of Item 5 on your agenda. As you may recall some time ago the Committee asked that I get an acknowledgement from the Board of School Committee that they were willing to pay the cost involved in switching those two points. They took it up at their July meeting. I attached the minutes to my letter and sent it to the Committee but I would note that that same topic was taken up as part of Item 5 along with the Emergency Operations Center and the Health Department.

Chairman O'Neil asked are you saying that we can receive and file that item if we have already addressed it.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I would just note that you addressed it as part of Item 5 and receive and file it.

Chairman O'Neil asked Dr. Sullivan do you concur.

Dr. Sullivan answered once we can do those two connections that will complete the connections as part of the 2003 cable extension I believe correct Tom.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied yes.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have one quick item and Grace I don't want you to run away. It was brought to my attention and I reached out to both Diane Prew and Grace about this one, we have an ordinance and it is 32.069 Systems Advisory Committee, that goes back to 1979. It was amended once in 1979. It reflects language and make-up of 1979 and I would like to refer this to the Solicitor, MCTV and Information Systems. I think it is a committee that with the proper make-up could be of great use to us with a lot of the technical issues we have. It

talks about electronic data processing services. I would like to get a motion to refer it to the Solicitor, Info. Systems and MCTV. I don't know if the Clerk needs to be on that or not. Would the Clerk like to join those discussions?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered no.

Chairman O'Neil well anybody else necessary to come back with an ordinance change with a composition of the committee. We are finding out that things are getting done but it is not always connected right. We need the School District and it says School Department here and that they need to be a partner in this thing with us to make sure that everything we do talks to one another and all of the capabilities are tapping every source we have. Can I get a motion on that?

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez it was voted to have the Solicitor, Info. Systems, MCTV and any other departments necessary get together to review Ordinance 32.069 and come back with an ordinance amendment and a list of committee members.

Alderman Lopez stated going back to Grace do you have an Advisory Board.

Dr. Sullivan responded I sent the Advisory Committee names, a great group of people, to the Vice-Chair of the School Committee. Unfortunately that was not brought up but it will be brought up in the January meeting. The Board of School Committee had other things that they were finishing up with. It will be announced early in January. It is a great group of people and hopefully we will be able to start working soon.

Alderman Lopez asked when that is approved by the School Board could you get us a copy.

Dr. Sullivan answered certainly.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee